

CARMEL CLAY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes

July 20, 2005

REPRESENTING THE CITY OF CARMEL:

Brewer, Scott / Environmental Planner	
Gajownik, Brooke / Hamilton County 911 Coordinator	
Griffin, Matt / Planning & Zoning	
Hoyes, Greg / County Surveyor's	
Hoyt, Gary / Fire Marshal	
McBride, Mike / Hamilton County Highway	
Redden, Nick / Engineering	Arnold, Nathan / City Engineering
Shupperd, Chuck / Vectren Energy	
South, John / Hamilton County Soil & Water	

- Page 3. Davis & Bales, lots 7pt-8: The Deacon Restaurant**
- Page 4. Docket No. 05060040 Z and 05060041 ADLS: 116th and College PUD**
- Page 6. Docket No. 05060042 DP Amend/ADLS: Carmel Science and Technology Park, Blk 11**
- Page 8. Docket No. 05060043 PP: Laurel Ridge**
- Page 11. Docket No. 05070017 TAC: Overbrook Farms Construction Plans**
- Page 13. 05060038 PP Amend and 05060039 SP: Little Farms Addition, Lots 31-33 (Replat)**
- Page 15. Docket No. 05060052 SP: Village of West Clay, sec 9003**
- Page 16. Docket No. 05070011 TAC: Khara Spa – Village of West Clay**
- Page 17. Docket No. 05070012 SP: Goldwater Park – Village of West Clay**
- Page 19. Docket No. 05070013 SP: Village of West Clay Section 6002**

Page	20.	Docket No. 05070010 SP: Murphy Hall Section One
Page	21.	Docket No. 05060053 DP/ADLS: Weston Pointe Retail Center
Page	25.	Docket No. 05070014 SP: Stanford Park Section 2
Page	26.	Docket No. 05070016 SP: Longridge Estates Section 2
Page	27.	Docket No. 05070007 SP: Mayflower Park Block 3 Replat
Page	28.	Docket No. 05070009 TAC: Kipp Brothers Expansion
Page	30.	Docket No. 05060051 PP: The Retreat of West Clay Primary Plat
Page	31.	Docket No. 05070005 SP: Penn View Heights Replat (Burford Office Park)

Davis & Bales, lots 7pt-8: The Deacon Restaurant

The applicant seeks use variance approval for a restaurant.

Docket No. 05050028 UV	ZO Chapter 8.01	permitted uses
Docket No. 05050029 V	ZO Chapter 25.07.02-08.b	number of signs
Docket No. 05050030 V	ZO Chapter 25.07.02-08.b	two signs oriented west
Docket No. 05050031 V	ZO Chapter 25.07.02-08.b	one sign oriented south
Docket No. 05050032 V	ZO Chapter 27.05	reduced parking spaces

The site is located at 31 First Street SE and is zoned R-2/Residence within the Old Town Character Sub area.

Filed by Mark Demerly of Demerly Architects for EF Holding, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Mandy Howard, Roger Ward Engineering
Ben Dikemen, Roger Ward Engineering
Jimmy Dillon

Petitioner Presentation – The project is a restaurant located at 31 First Street.

- Pictures of the current building were then passed around.
- Greg Hoyes, Hamilton County Surveyor's Office – Had already faxed a comment letter to Mark Demerly. Hamilton County Surveyor's Office did not really have any comments on the rezone. When it comes back for construction plans they will need to see drainage calculations.
- Chuck Shupperd, Vectren Energy – Asked if it had gas. Also asked if they were going to use gas for the restaurant part.
The petitioner responded yes.
- Chuck Shupperd had a contact person who would do the service. There are gas mains to the north and both sides of the site, so they will be able to provide the site with service.
- Brooke Gajownik, Hamilton County Sheriff's Office – Had no comment.
- Nick Redden, City of Carmel Engineering – Did not receive plans of the site and did not have any comments on the rezone, but will expect drainage calculations and plans at a later date.
- Gary Hoyt, Carmel Fire Department – Sent a fax to Roger Ward for Mark Demerly, and Mark Demerly said that the building was going to be sprinkled. What he may do is go past the site to see where the locations of the fire hydrants are.

The petitioner said that there was one directly across the street.

- Scott Brewer, Urban Forester – Did not have any comments on the rezone.
- The landscaping that he had gotten so far he said looked OK, but he said that he didn't see any planting along the wall on the east side that they had talked about.
- Also he will eventually need an actual landscape plan with a plant schedule and planting detail, etc. but will not need it for the rezone.
- Scott Brewer said that since the petitioner has most of the parking across the street, and since the petitioner does not meet code on landscaping that he was hoping that the petitioner would

share some of the cost of the landscaping across the street for the parking lot.

The petitioner said that that was the first he had heard of that.

- Scott said that is how they normally do it, but it is something they can discuss.

The petitioner also said that one of the things he was trying to do is to put more of a landscaping buffer around the alleyway.

- Matt Griffin, Department of Community Services – The department had sent a letter and had no additional comments.

...END...

Docket No. 05060040 Z and 05060041 ADLS: 116th and College PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 12.4 acres from R1/Residential and B6/Business to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of town home, retail, and office uses.

The site is located at NE corner of 116th Street and College Ave.

Filed by Timothy Ochs of Ice Miller for Equicor Development Inc.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Mark Zukerman

Greg Small

Don Gwinnup

Matt DeLaruelle

Craig McCormick

Petitioner Presentation - The project is a planned unit development. It is a mix of 60 town homes and commercial retail. Plans were given to Scott Brewer. Trying to continue the theme of the buildings at 116th and Guilford. The idea is that the town homes would be a transitional use to the north of the parcel and back right up to the Pulte town homes with a stub street that joins the two to the north.

- Greg Hoyes – sent a comment letter. Thought that the drainage calculations for the Fretig Watershed were fine. They are going to wait for Carmel; they want to make sure that it works in with their road plans at 116th Street.

- Greg had an issue with the detention area.

The petitioner said that the detention area will probably be wet, and they plan on having a similar setup as the Townhomes at Guilford. It will have about 3 feet of water in it at all times. The petitioner is going to put a fence up around it like the Townhomes at Guilford.

- Greg said that they could put their heads together with Carmel to make sure it is safe.

- Chuck Shupperd – Said that they had gas on 116th and College. Once they get their final layout Vectren Energy can sit down with them to see where the meter locations are on the building so Vectren Energy can design their main layout and utility easements.

- Brooke Gajownik – Had no comments.

- Nick Redden – Sent comments and will wait to hear their responses.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter to Matt over at Ice Miller. Asked if the buildings would have a sprinkler system.

The petitioner did not know at this point. Maybe the big building would be fully sprinkled.

- Gary Hoyt said they should get together sometime to discuss where the fire department connection would be placed. Probably they will go with a wall post indicator valve, because no one likes to see those red pipes hanging up out of the ground.

- Gary Hoyt asked about fire hydrants along 116th Street.

The petitioner said that there were no fire hydrants along 116th Street because there is no main to hook up to.

- Gary Hoyt also asked if any of the buildings would have basements.

The petitioner said no.

- Gary Hoyt said that more than likely if the buildings are sprinkled then they will have some type of fire alarm or at least a flow alarm, and if the petitioner does have some sort of full fire alarm system then he would request a remote enunciator some place along the main portion of the building.

- Gary Hoyt – Are those town homes the ones under construction now or are they not part of your project.

The petitioner said that those were Pulte.

- Scott Brewer – Asked if the town homes would be coming through separately or as part of this.

The petitioner said as part of this.

- Scott Brewer said he would need plans for the town homes then and a copy of the PUD ordinance.

The petitioner asked if he wanted that as a separate sheet or together.

- Scott Brewer said it did not matter, and that separate would be fine.

- Matt Griffin – Sent an email with a comment later, and the department had several comments about the PUD ordinance, and some of the design of the site. The staff is really excited with the layout, but there are a few things that need to be adjusted and worked on.

- Matt Griffin – One of the department's issues was that the petitioner is parking the non-residential space at 1 space per 300 and the ordinance asks for 1 to 200. The department will not be hard fast on keeping them to that, but Matt Griffin does think that there are some opportunities to get some more parking out of the site. The department is working with the engineering department to explore potential parallel and angle parking along College at least, and then maybe parallel parking on some of the internal streets.

The petitioner would be open to that. The petitioner asked if College was Carmel's.

- Matt Griffin said he believed so.

The petitioner next wanted to make sure that the engineering department looked at it so it was viable for people to use.

- Matt Griffin said the engineering would verify all of their ideas. He also mentioned snuggling the pedestrian path up to the building and having some outdoor seating.

The petitioner said that utilities would be an issue, because CINergy wants to relocate their distribution line down the north side of 116th in an easement between the building and the right-of-way.

- Matt Griffin said that should not be a problem if the path is moved because then there would be more room for the utilities to work with. The department would also like to see the project focused outward, with people on the outside going in.

The petitioner agreed and said that is what they were trying to do with the corner where the pathway became the front stoop. He also said that from a signage perspective and from an architectural perspective as one drives down 116th it will become the fronts of the buildings. It was mentioned that they might set up a separate meeting with the department.

- Matt Griffin agreed and would be open for a meeting when they had time.

...END...

Docket No. 05060042 DP Amend/ADLS: Carmel Science and Technology Park, Blk 11

The applicant seeks approval for a medical office building.

The site is located at the SW corner of Carmel Dr. and Guilford Rd. and is zoned M-3/Manufacturing. Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Mary Solada

Anne Marie Varga

Ashton Fritz, Schneider Corporation

Dan Brueggert, CSO Schenkel Shultz

Ross Goyer, Bremner Healthcare

Bob Falk, Duke Realty

The plan for the site is a 2-story office building, with approximately 50,000 square feet. There is a brick exterior, with aluminum windows, and a canopied drop off up front for medical use. The petitioner thinks that there is some potential to do some retail uses on the northern part of the site, however they have not defined those uses at this time, and are only presenting the 2 story office building at this time.

- Greg Hoyes – Faxed Ashton Fritz a letter. He wants to make sure that with the new street coming out to Guilford Road, they do not lose any detention volume. Would like some guardrails or bollards to protect vehicles turning so they do not go toward the lake.

- Greg Hoyes said that the biggest concern is the 9 x 9 structure that is going to tie all the drainage together. He will look further into that and will make any comments on that.

- Mike McBride – No comment.

- Chuck Shupperd – Asked if they were going to use gas for heating.

The petitioner said that the project was planned to be a sister to the one on Michigan Road and that is all electric, and so he would assume that this building would be all electric as well.

- Chuck Shupperd said that they could contact Vectren.

- John South – Sent a letter. Asked the petitioner to include the building construction in the construction sequence, along with immediately stabilizing the disturbed area around the pond perimeter after work is completed there.

- He has also been fairly consistent in asking that sites provide some post construction practices before they discharge from the site to the pond. That can be in the form of catch basins and snouts, pervious pavements, etc.

- Brooke Gajownik – No comments.

- Nick Redden – Sent a letter with comments and will await the petitioner's response.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter to Ashton Fritz. Needs to set up a meeting to discuss where the fire department connection for the building will go.

- Would like a set of plans for the site to show where existing fire hydrants are and where the water utilities are.

- Asked if the building was going to have a basement.

The petitioner said no.

- More than likely the building is sprinkled so probably there is some type of fire alarm system and the fire department would request an enunciator panel remote and an enunciator panel, located at the main entrance some place. It will probably be the same way the other building is on Michigan Road.

- Gary Hoyt would also like to have a Knox-box on the building too.

- Scott Brewer – Sent out an email. The main thing is the buffer yards, especially along the south side along the drainage easement. Bob had said that they were going to let all of the vegetation remain there, and Scott Brewer had said that he needs to have a letter from the surveyor's office indicating that that would be OK with them.

- Scott Brewer also said that the landscape buffer on the north side is a little light, but they can probably work with it depending on if the parking lot design changes at all.

- Matt Griffin – The department sent a letter, but otherwise he had no additional comments.

The petitioner said that they are drafting a response to that letter which will be sent out fairly soon.

The petitioner asked if the existing landscape buffer was OK to remain within the easement.

- Greg Hoyes said that he would have to look, but if it exists then it will probably be fine, especially if it is pretty much on the property line.

...END...

Docket No. 05060043 PP: Laurel Ridge

The applicant seeks approval to plat 17 lots on 47.12 acres with the following Subdivision Waivers:

Docket No. 05060044 SW: 6.03.04 – Connectivity: To seek relief from providing stub streets to adjoining properties.

Docket No. 05060045 SW: 8.09.02 – Alternative Transportation: To seek relief from providing a pedestrian path along Ditch Road.

Docket No. 05060046 SW: 6.03.19 – Access to Arterials, Parkways, and Collectors: To seek relief from houses fronting collector streets/200 foot required separation from collector streets.

Docket No. 05060047 SW: 6.03.22 – Acceleration/Deceleration, and Passing Lanes: To seek relief from providing acceleration/deceleration and passing lanes.

Docket No. 05060048 SW: 8.09.02 – Private Streets: To allow the construction of private streets serving the entire subdivision.

Docket No. 05060049 SW: 8.09.02 – Cul de Sac Length: To allow cul de sacs to exceed 600 feet in length.

Docket No. 05060050 SW: 6.02.01 – Subdivision in Floodway/Plain: To allow subdivision of land within the floodway and floodplain.

The site is located at the SE corner of Ditch Road and W. 106th Street and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by Joseph Calderon of JBC1, LLC for JB Cohen

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Lance Farrow
JB Cohen

The petitioner is looking to make a very nice subdivision consisting of 17 lots at 106th and Ditch Road. It will be a privacy fence, gated community type of project. The petitioner presented a drawing. There are two existing lakes with a creek running through the site.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter to Lance Farrow. Commented on the variance regarding the subdivision in the floodplain, and the Surveyor's Office will require that the flood plain all be put in a drainage easement. Spring Mill Run will become part of the Spring Mill Run regulated drain. They will have to look at some outlet options for the existing lake on the north.

The petitioner asked if Greg Hoyes had any information on the pipes where he asked them to connect at 106th and Ditch where there are two structures.

- Greg Hoyes said that the Highway Department did that.

The petitioner said he thinks that there is a pipe that goes south to the subdivision across the street, which has two ponds with a three-lot plat. He is assuming that there is a pipe that goes down there and there is a culvert that goes from their existing lake underneath the road to a pipe and then goes into the two lakes. The petitioner would just like to get any information in regards to the pipe, what size it is, and where it goes. He thinks that he can help out with the situation; he just wants to know a little bit more about that pipe itself.

- Greg Hoyes said that he would check his files

- Mike McBride - Said that there is a roundabout project proposed for the intersection and he is sure that they have a lot of data on drainage plans and so forth. The Hamilton County Highway

Department will require a little bit more right-of-way than the petitioner had proposed. He thinks it is all mostly right at the corner.

- Mike McBride asked if the site was eligible for annexation.

The petitioner said that they are anticipating annexation.

- Next Mike McBride asked if they knew when they were planning on being annexed and if it was before construction.

The petitioner did not know.

- Mike McBride is also concerned about the cul-de-sac length, which would require their commissioners to grant a variance on that. The Highway Department's standard practice is to require deceleration lanes at entrances.

The petitioner asked if they were in the process of drawing up the roundabout, and asked if he could get a copy of that. That way they could coordinate with drainage and such.

- Mike McBride also sent an application for review.

The petitioner said that they have that and are finishing filling it out.

- Chuck Shupperd – He has gas around Ditch, but also has that high-pressure line going through there. Said that the petitioner might call Steve Caulk and get some depth before the petitioner starts running stuff out because that is an older piece that was panhandled and could be only a couple feet deep.

- The sheet that Chuck Shupperd gave the petitioner has the contractor who is going to the onsite stuff for equipment and specs that are crossing. It needs to be filled out, then sent back to Steve, and then they will send to the lending department to draw up the encroachments for what can and cannot be done. Chuck Shupperd would recommend that the petitioner spot some depths across there.

- John South – Sent a letter. The soil conditions are not quite what the soil survey indicates they are. There has been a lot of disturbance out there with construction of ponds and grading and so forth. It should be taken into consideration with the homebuilding and so forth, that additional caution needs to be made when putting foundations in the ground.

- By the time this project reaches construction plan stage, John South thinks that the petitioner will have to meet the County's requirement for post construction water quality. This means that they will have to meet the total suspended solid reduction by 80%. At this point John South thinks that this is realistic and that they need to be designing the project to meet those goals.

The petitioner asked if there were guidelines for acceptable practices.

- John South did not know if the petitioner's plan would meet the requirements, but the ordinance is passed and is on the website so that the petitioner could read the post construction water quality requirements. The post construction water quality handbook or guidebook is being finalized, but it has not been printed yet. What practices will be allowed and what will not be as far as standard procedures is still up in the air. He thinks that the guidelines will be quite similar to what is in Indianapolis. Bob Thompson in the Surveyor's Office may be another source of information.

- John South next mentioned the drainage system that the petitioner is draining into which is west of lot 5, and that it was in rather poor shape in the past. He does not know if it has been upgraded or changed any, and it probably needs to be looked at.

The petitioner said that they are willing to help as far as taking some drainage away from that area, but they will need some help back, because when they go to the creek it is a 40-foot drop. There is no room to put any type of detention, and they would have to draw a squirrel or

something to meet all the requirements. The petitioner said that they do, but it is just a little bit different practice than most people think.

- John South also made the comment that flood insurance issues might be minimized if they kept the flood plain in the common area. His understanding is that if any part of a lot is shown to be in a flood plain then the insurance companies start throwing up red flags, and at that point the owner has to prove that they are not in the flood plain. It would be his recommendation that the total flood plains would be in the common area, and that would eliminate some future issues.

That is certainly not a requirement, but a recommendation.

- John South commented about the lake west of lot 15 that will be constructed in scholls, which is sand and gravel subsoil. The lake to the left of lot 15 will complicate construction issues. It is recommended that the natural drainage for lot 13 be protected with an easement. Also it is recommended to maintain flow in the future from other lots.

The petitioner said that they would take that into consideration.

- Brooke Gajownik - She noticed on the plans that there were 2 names on the plans and then 3 additional street names on the street name chart on the bottom. None of the street names have gone through the approval process with Carmel Communications and Accounting. The petitioner should contact Bill Akers at Carmel Communications, so that he can get everything on the form and then she can make sure that it is 911 approved.

- Nick Redden – Had no comment because it is outside his jurisdiction at the time.

- Gary Hoyt - Sent a letter. Since it will be gated he is requesting an SOS type device or a fire department key switch, preferably the Knox brand.

- Since this subdivision would be so close, the Fire Department would probably prefer the SOS type because they might have Washington Township assist them running there because it is right down the street from one of their stations.

The petitioner asked if there was a certain place to put it.

- Gary Hoyt said that it did not really matter which side it would be on.

- Gary Hoyt also asked if the petitioner was going to have an amenity, but he doubts it.

- Gary Hoyt was going to send the petitioner a plot for the turning radius of their largest piece of equipment. His concern were teardrop islands in the cul-de-sac and wanted to make sure that they could get around them. He also asked if the petitioner was looking at roll curb, but the petitioner said they had not gotten into that much detail yet.

- Gary Hoyt also needed a set of plans showing the fire hydrant layout, and he asked for the little blue reflectors that are placed in the street perpendicular to the fire hydrant.

The petitioner asked if it obstructs snow removal or comes off.

- Gary Hoyt said that they are identical to the white reflectors on the interstate, and that snowplows do not take them off.

- Scott Brewer – Did not have landscape plans yet.

The petitioner said they would get those to him.

- Matt Griffin – Had a review letter forthcoming. In regard to the waiver from installing the outer path, it will probably be very hard to get that approved in the plan commission because they are pretty adamant about seeing those paths go in. It may save the petitioner some time in

the long run if they start to anticipate doing that. Even though the path may not connect sometime right now, but it will eventually in the future.

- Matt Griffin also asked if the common areas were going to be just visual amenities or if there would be a path or any type of interactivity.

The petitioner said the common areas were just going to be visual amenities.

- Greg Hoyes – Mentioned that if the path spans the creek then they would have to look into how to do that.

- Matt Griffin said that it might be possible to commit to pay to a fund to fund the installation of the path.

- Mike McBride – Something else occurred to him, he doesn't know what the lane widths are on the existing Ditch Road, but they typically require a 12 foot with a 3 foot shoulder. Then the structure south of the entrance becomes in question. It would be looked into.

The petitioner would like to set up a meeting with Greg Hoyes to walk the site and look at the cliff and the trees that he wants removed.

...END...

Docket No. 05070017 TAC: Overbrook Farms Construction Plans

The applicant seeks review of the construction documents for this subdivision of 97 lots on 79 acres.

The site is located NW of 141st/Shelborne Rd and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by Dave Barnes of Weihe Engineers for WTFOT, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Dave Barnes, Weihe Engineers

Dave Molten

Jerry Houston

The project is 111 lots on 84 plus or minus acres.

- Greg Hoyes – Did not get a comment letter done. Needed drainage calculations. Brought up the Primary Plat that went through the April TAC meeting, and the discussion about putting the creek in common areas. The construction plans, however, still showed the lots lines going to the creek. There needs to be a change in the plans. He just wanted to make sure they were not forgetting that.

- Greg Hoyes will give the petitioner a comment letter when he receives drainage calculations.

- Mike McBride – Sent the petitioner a comment letter a few months ago. Has not seen a set of plans since that.

The petitioner said they would get that to him.

- Chuck Shupperd – Said that Vectren Energy is working on all sides on getting easements. Said that the water company was also looking to get easements, and did not know if the water company will be following the same route.

The petitioner said that there is an easement for John on 141st Street, extending from Shelborne.

- Chuck Shupperd thought that it might be beneficial to do a joint venture. He does not know if it would be feasible, but just wanted to suggest it and possibly have everybody get together.

The petitioner said that he would look into that.

- John South – Sent a comment letter. Made a comment that he thinks they will at least need a 401 permit and a construction of the floodway permit for the crossing. Said that maybe the creek was not up to a square mile, he did not know. Both of those need to be checked into.

- John South said that one of the big issues is that the petitioner is taking a lot of dirt out of the ponds, but have not indicated on the grading plan where the dirt is going. As far as the erosion sediment control plan, that is a needed item. The plan kind of makes the assumption that there are no paths and very little grading activity on the lots, but if there is going to be considerable grading and the dirt is going to be pushed around then more information is needed on that.

- John South also mentioned that since the site is so large, he would like them to phase the project so as to limit the disturbance. He would like to keep it around 20 acre increments, so that the petitioner will not tear up the 79 acres all at once and leave it that way for a while, deciding to seed it all at the end. There needs to be some kind of rational as to how to progress through construction for both the disturbance and the seeding behind it as they go.

The petitioner said he would talk with the client and the contractor about that.

- John South mentioned that because the site has some existing drainage ways directing site water off site, sill fence is not adequate to act as a perimeter practice, so the project will need some sediment basins or sediment traps, or some kind of diversion methods to direct that storm water so it is properly treated before it leaves the site.

- John South said that native vegetation on the bank of the big pond in the middle is not necessarily something the petitioner wants to do, but John South wants to encourage it on the other ponds where it is logical.

- John South would also like to see the rock check damn that is being shown at the culvert removed. The sediment should be captured before it gets into the creek and not in the creek. It is shown on the east side of the proposed roadway crossing.

- Brooke Gajownik – Did not believe she received a packet but does know that the petitioner has lots of street names pre-approved; she just was not able to check and see if those were the ones on the plan. As long as what they have approved is on the plan, it will be fine.

- Nick Redden – Sent a comment letter, and will await the petitioner's response.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Asked if the petitioner was going to put an amenity building on the site like a pool or a pool house.

The petitioner said no.

- Gary Hoyt – Would like to see the blue fire hydrant markers some place shown on the plan.

The petitioner said it had already been done.

- Scott Brewer – Has not seen an open space plan for the project.

- Dave Barnes said that he thought they originally had one.
Matt Griffin said he thought there might be one in the primary plat folder.
- Scott Brewer asked for a copy of the open space plan.
 - Scott Brewer said he might send the petitioner a comment on the graphic planting detail.
 - Matt Griffin – Did not have any additional comments on the construction plans.

...END...

**05060038 PP Amend and 05060039 SP: Little Farms Addition,
Lots 31-33 (Replat)**

The applicant seeks approval to replat 9 lots on 2.25 acres:
The site is located at the northwest corner of Ethel Street and West 104th Street.
The site is zoned R-3/Residence within the Home Place Overlay.
Filed by Chris Badger of Badger Engineering & Associates.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Chris Badger

- The petitioner presented the project saying that the previous plans showed a cul-de-sac, but it did not do the project any benefits. Also, the ownership has changed from one developer to another, who is Ryan Thomas. The new design Chris Badger believes is better, and there are no major changes to the drainage or sanitary. They are still completing some of the changes that had been requested from the county highway. The other thing that was asked of the petitioner by the fire department was to put a radius on the plan that they could use a little bit better. Chris Badger asked what radius would work for the fire department.

Gary Hoyt – Said that he would send a sheet with a turning radius and specifications. His main question was whether or not there was a way to improve the alley to the east of the property so that he may be able to move a truck up and down it.

- Chris Badger said that the alley was 15 feet wide and it will be a one way. He thinks that it should be able to work. He wants to make sure he can get an overhang so that he can show what the interior radius needs to be changed to. He was thinking that 30 feet would be all right, but that the trucks would use the whole road.

- Gary Hoyt said that he did not know the total dimensions or length of the truck, with the basket hanging toward the front, he might be worried about the trees.

- Chris Badger said that they did have trees that they are trying to preserve along the upper west and north side of the property. Previously they had a landscape strip along the area of the alley, and that will be removed. Some landscaping could be added in, but there is a 30-foot wide drainage easement that the county surveyor wants him to keep for all of the pipes.

- Chris Badger said that he thinks the 15 foot wide alley will be OK and then they just have to work on the radius.

- Chris Badger also said that there is one other lot, but it is just a building lot and they will build the same type of home. The buildings will be duplexes. Construction plans had not been sent

out yet because there were some changes that occurred so those will have to be made. When he talked to the sanitary they said that it was short enough not to require an IDEM submittal. The road is in the same location where it connected in with Ethel.

- Greg Hoyes – Said he would wait for the construction plans.

- Mike McBride – If it is a different developer than the one that had been submitted previously then he will need a new application and fees. When those things are met and he gets the fee out he will send a letter expressing his approval.

The petitioner said that there is no access other than the street on Ethel. There is only access on 104th and there will be 6 accesses there for 6 driveways, and 1 on Turner.

Turner will be a public street as well as a public alley. The market is very positive and 8 of the units have already been sold.

- Matt Griffin asked if the duplexes would be sold as wholes or as halves.

The petitioner thinks that the units will be sold as halves. The units have 3 bedrooms with a two-car garage and a back patio.

- Chuck Shupperd – Asked if the builder was a gas builder.

The petitioner thinks there will be gas but he can check for sure.

- Chuck Shupperd said that there was gas at 104th and Ethel, but for the last 4 lots down toward the alley gas will have to be extended.

- Chuck Shupperd also asked if since each half of the duplex would be sold separately, there would be an imaginary line for the property line where the houses come together.

The petitioner said that yes there would be full ownership of half of the home from wall to wall.

- Chuck Shupperd asked because if each person will own their half of the duplex, then service will run to each home.

- John South – Said he sent a letter a while back and he thought that the only problem was post construction water quality.

Chris Badger said that they had talked about using a hooded inlet. The detention is on site, and it is in the size of the pipe that they put in. The pipe along 104th is a larger pipe, and it has been oversized to be able to back up the water and to lead it back into the homeplace drainage. There is a legal drain that runs through there, and that drain is pretty tight. All of the water quality will occur prior to that. He said that they really do want to get out all of the solids, so they have shown catch basins and hoods on all of the units and that should keep the twigs and the leaves from causing a problem.

- Brooke Gajownik – Turner Court has been changed to Turner Drive, which is good. She did fill out a new approval form and sent it to Bill Akers. She told the petitioner to make sure he got that for when he goes to get it recorded because he will need that.

- Nick Redden – Said that the development was outside his jurisdiction.

- Gary Hoyt - said that when they break for lunch he would fax them the spreadsheet.

- Scott Brewer – Asked to be sent a new drawing with the new street layout on it. He also asked if the cul-de-sac had already been cleared.

Chris Badger said that some of it had been cleared. He does not think that the whole cul-de-sac has been cleared, though.

- Scott Brewer said they might be able to save some of those trees now.

Chris Badger said he thought so.

- Matt Griffin – Said that the department had no real content changes; there were just some little things that needed to be changed such as labeling.

...END...

Docket No. 05060052 SP: Village of West Clay, sec 9003

The applicant seeks to plat 23 residential lots on 13.09 acres±.

The site is located northeast of 131st Street and Towne Road and is zoned PUD/Planned Unit Development.

Filed by Brandon Burke of the Schneider Corp. for Brenwick TND Communities, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Brandon Burke, Schneider Corporation
Jaime Ford

Brandon Burke said that section 9003 is located in the north section of the Village of West Clay. It is north of 131st Street. It is composed of 23 lots, and approximately 13.1 acres. Section 9003 is bounded to the south by section 112 and also by section 9002. 9003 will have a connection point to the future 9002, which is currently under review as well as 112. Another adjoining section is 9001, which is under construction.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter. Said that the petitioner is missing showing picking up the town point arm.

The petitioner said that they would look into that.

- Greg Hoyes also said that there are 3 trees on a pipe run that he would like to be shifted a little farther away from the pipe.

- Mike McBride – The area had been annexed by Carmel so it was out of his road network, and he had no comments.

- Chuck Shupperd – He did not see any problems. Asked if there was a knee date of not until 2006.

The petitioner said that that was not correct. The petitioner said that they were looking to have section 9003 paved by the end of the year. Depending on how Vectren Energy falls in that process, January may or may not fit.

- John South – Said that he owed the petitioner a letter.
- Brooke Gajownik – Said she did not receive a packet, though it is probably somewhere at the sheriff's office. Therefore, she was not able to look at the street names to make sure they were approved.
- Nick Redden – Sent a comment letter and will wait to hear the petitioner's responses.
- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Asked if there was an amenity in this section.
The petitioner said that there is **not** an amenity in this section. The only amenity on the north side is in section 112.
- Scott Brewer – Did receive landscape plans. He was OK with landscape plans.
- Matt Griffin – A comment letter was sent. The department did not have any major concerns.

...END...

Docket No. 05070011 TAC: Khara Spa – Village of West Clay

The applicant seeks to create a 2 story, 2,210 sq. ft. per floor building for spa related services.

The site is located near the NW corner of Rhettisbury St. and Meeting House Rd within the Village of West Clay and is zoned PUD.

Filed by Brandon Burke of Schneider Engineering for DBA Beyond the Image, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Brandon Burke
Jaime Ford
Silouen Green
Rick Renschen

The petitioner presented the project saying that the Khara Spa building is located in block F of section 3001 in the Village Center. The building will consist of 2200 square feet per floor. It will be a 2-story building. Both floors will be spa related services.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter. The only thing he will need is an outlet permit.
- Chuck Shupperd – He thought the building just south of the project had a 2 inch plastic main in the back, and will probably just need to extend it a little bit for this project.
- Jon South – Sent a letter. The project is less than 1 acre so it therefore does not fall under Rule 5. It is part of a large common plan and there are some minimum requirements for that. He

asked the petitioner to include those minimum requirements on the plans.

- Brooke Gajownik – Had no comment

- Nick Redden – Sent a comment letter.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Asked if the building would be sprinkled.

The petitioner said it would not be.

- Gary Hoyt made sure there was no basement and that it was only 2 stories in height. He would like to see a Knox-box on the building for emergency access. Asked if it would be mixed use or if both stories would be spa related.

The petitioner said that both stories **would be** spa related.

- Scott Brewer – Said he did not get landscape plans.

The petitioner said they are currently looking at what the landscape requirements are. Currently they are looking to have sod around with street trees in front. He thinks that the HVAC units would be on the roof and not on the ground for landscaping to screen. The petitioner will follow up with Scott Brewer based on the review process within Brenwick for landscaping.

- Matt Griffin – Said that he would need copies of the elevations, specifically as to how the HVACs are screened at the top. Also trash enclosure details will be needed.

...END...

Docket No. 05070012 SP: Goldwater Park – Village of West Clay

The applicant seeks to plat 1 lot on 7.13 acres for the purpose of creating a multi amenity park.

The site is located near the SW corner of W. 131st Street and Towne Rd and is zoned PUD.

Filed by Brandon Burke of Schneider Engineering for Brenwick TND Communities, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Brandon Burke, Schneider Corporation

Jaime Ford, Schneider Corporation

Brandon Burke presented the project saying that Goldwater Park is located on the west side of Town Road, south of 131st and north of 126th. It will be the primary and only amenity center located west of Town Road. Goldwater Park area is on the north side of section 6001 and will be bordered on the east side by Pedigrew Drive. The project property will basically traverse

northwest. All of the utilities will basically come out of section 6001 at this point and time. Part of the amenities will be a clubhouse facility. There will be a pool area. Also proposed are tennis courts, basketball courts, and a little league baseball field.

- Greg Hoyes - Sent a letter. He requested an outlet permit. Also will need some nonenforcements for some drains that are in this section that are being covered by this plat. He will have to send the petitioner to the drainage board for the baseball diamond and the dry detention basin just to get a variance from that for liability reasons. He also needs a landscape plan.

The petitioner said that the landscape plan is being completed and revised. There is extensive landscaping. He expects it to be done very shortly. The petitioner is still ironing out a couple of walkway locations, some trees, and some of the buffer areas along the western border. The landscape plan will be sent out to all parties when it is finished.

- Chuck Shupperd asked if the project would require gas.
The petitioner did not know at the time.

- John South – Sent a letter. He said he approved the plan. Then he asked if it was logical to have some kind of a clean out or drain for when the pool is cleaned to be able to pump pool water into the sanitary sewer instead of the storm sewer.

The petitioner said that he would try to look into that.

- Brooke Gajownik – Had no comment

- Nick Redden – Sent a comment letter and will await the petitioner's response.

- Gary Hoyt – Asked if it would be equipped with an automatic fire sprinkler system.
The petitioner said that he would follow up with a letter.

- Gary Hoyt next asked if there would be a basement.

The petitioner responded that there would **not be**.

- Gary Hoyt also requested to have a Knox-box on the building.

- Scott Brewer – Would be happy to comment when he receives landscape plans.

- Matt Griffin – The department had sent a letter and had no additional comments.

...END...

Docket No. 05070013 SP: Village of West Clay Section 6002

The applicant seeks to plat 61 lots on 22 acres.

The site is located at the NW corner of W. 126th Street and Towne Rd and is zoned PUD.

Filed by Brandon Burke of Schneider Engineering for Brenwick TND Communities, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Brandon Burke, Schneider Corporation

Jaime Ford, Schneider Corporation

- Brandon Burke introduced the project saying that it is composed of 61 lots on approximately 22 acres. The project is bordered to the south by 126th Street and to the north by section 6001, which is currently under construction. The 6001 plans were updated to include the section 6002 storm sewers, which should have been facilitated through the proper reviewers. This will frame in a lot of the infrastructure that was deemed off sight for section 6001.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter. The storms have already been taken care of. There were some SSD Laterals that were missing in both sets of plans, 6001 and 6002. He needs to see Block B as a dedicated drainage easement. There were also a few conflicts on the landscaping plan, which was stated in the letter.

The petitioner asked about the pond and if it is not a pond to pond regulated drain and it is reduced to a 20 foot easement if it would be possible to have trees within 10 feet or should they stick with the typical 15 feet.

- Greg Hoyes said that would be workable.

- Chuck Shupperd – They will come out of 6001 and also will probably have to make a connection out of 126th Street.

- John South – Still owes the petitioner a letter.

- Brooke Gajownik – The street names were already pre-approved so everything looked good.

- Nick Redden – Sent a comment letter, and will await a response.

- Gary Hoyt – Wanted to ask about the chance of widening Woodley Street to make it at least a 24-foot wide street. It is 19 right now. He would also like the oval with the green in the middle shortened a little bit. It would make it easier to get a truck in there.

- Gary Hoyt also asked if there was any on street parking.

Jaime Ford said that there was **not** any on street parking in that common area.

Brandon Burke said that they do not have any proposed spaces, but the ordinance might allow parking, and so they would have to look into that.

- Gary Hoyt asked whether the petitioner knew if there would be town homes or single-family residences.

The petitioner did not know at the time and would have to verify with the developer. To the north there will be town homes.

- Scott Brewer – Had not received plans.

The petitioner brought in the street layouts with the specific species for review for sections 6001 and 6002. In addition, a landscape architect is working on the entire west side. Plans for several areas are being developed and a final product is expected fairly soon so that Scott might review them together instead of in separate little pieces.

- Matt Griffin – Had sent a letter, and had no additional comments.

...END...

Docket No. 05070010 SP: Murphy Hall Section One

The applicant seeks to plat 40 lots on 32.7 acres.

The site is located at the NW corner of W. 141st St. and Towne Road and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by J. Cort Crosby of Schneider Engineering for Estridge Development Co. Inc.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Craig Kunkle
Cort Crosby

The petitioner presented the project as the first 40 lots of Murphy Hall on 32 acres.

- Greg Hoyes – Will be sending out a comment letter in the next day or so now that he had received drainage calculations.

- Mike McBride – Asked if the only entrance was on 141st Street, and when the petitioner answered yes he said that the project was not in his road network so he had no comment.

- Chuck Shupperd – Was working on the design because they have a main off of 141st Street and will just extend it for the first section.

- Nick Redden – Sent a comment letter, and will await the petitioner's response.

The petitioner did not see anything in the comment letter that would be a huge problem.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Asked if the amenity was included in section 1 or section 2.

The petitioner responded that they would have to come back with a different set of plans for that.

- Gary Hoyt said that he would reserve his comments until after the petitioner brings in the plans for the amenity area.

- Scott Brewer – Sent a comment letter. Mostly the comments in the letter were species comments.

- Matt Griffin – Sent a letter on the 14th of July. He did not have anything additional. He did note that item 4 on the observations on the plat could be disregarded. It was a comment about adding monumentation, but apparently the monumentation is on there.

...END...

Docket No. 05060053 DP/ADLS: Weston Pointe Retail Center

The applicant seeks approval for multiple commercial/retail buildings.

The site is located at 11055 N. Michigan Rd. and is zoned B-2/Business within the US 421 Overlay.

Filed by Ronald Bell of Williams Realty Group for PL Properties, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Jacque Haynes, Williams Realty Group

Ron Bell

Darci Pellon, Civil Designs

The project is along the 421 corridor. There are 3 out lots in the front, and a bank on the corner (hopefully), and a sit down restaurant in the middle lot. A split use building will be on the north out lot, which will probably be a professional type building, and not a full retail use. In the back there are 2 buildings with approximately 25,000 square feet of retail that they have proposed. The buildings are adjoined together with a rotunda, which is open all the way up to the top. This is something that when Jon Dobosiewicz was here he had liked the rotundas of other projects that they had done. Strictly a service related center. They do not see any big boxes coming in. The bigger office building in the back is proposed to be the Williams Realty Group office building. The northeast corner of the project is a 7,000 square foot office building.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter. There is an existing regulated drain that was installed with the overall Weston Pointe. There will probably be some pipe added to that, which will become regulated, and then everything internal will be left private. He would like to see the drainage easements on the grading, utility, and landscape plan. He also needs to see a P and P sheet for that little bit of 36-inch pipe that is being added.

The petitioner asked if it was the P and P for the 232 inch that connects into the 36 inches that Greg Hoyes was referring to.

- Greg Hoyes said **yes**. It is for the ones that go under the road to the pond, more or less just the extension that the petitioner is adding.

- Greg Hoyes also said that there was some landscaping shown in a Kurt regulated drain easement and he would like that removed.

- Mike McBride – Had forwarded an application for review, and the Weston Pointe Drive is their street. The Hamilton County Highway Department would anticipate that they would have to have some right-of-way dedication. He was not sure what that would be yet. Typically they would have an accel/decel treatment for the entrance. Also, the pavement thickness within the right-of-way will need to match the existing pavement thickness out there.

- Chuck Shupperd – There is gas along Michigan Road and along Weston Pointe Drive. Once everything is approved he can sit down with the petitioner to discuss layout. The out lots can be serviced off of Michigan Road.

The petitioner said that Tim Dickson is the project manager and will probably be working with Vectren Energy and so the petitioner will be forwarding information on to him.

- John South – Sent a review letter. Would like more clarification on the plan and construction sequences to the order of the building construction, whether all of the buildings are planned to be built or just one. For those buildings that are not going to be built, the pads and so forth need to be seeded and stabilized. There are also needs to be some sort of erosion sediment control plan for each building itself.

The petitioner asked how John South would like the out lots to be maintained. Jacque Haynes said that they anticipate the bank on the corner to be under construction at the same time that they are doing the retail center. They anticipate being able to do that in the fall, but they will probably wait until after the winter conditions are past to start building the office building. She asked if they make them pad ready if John South wanted them seeded after that.

- John South said yes.

The petitioner said that their intent is to have all of the roads in, the curb cuts shown, get the land in pad ready condition and then that will be how they are marketing them price wise.

- John South asked if each of the lots would be sold.

The petitioner said that there would be probably 5 different ownerships throughout the whole project.

- John South said that if the individual project exceeds an acre, then they would have to have an individual Rule 5 application. If part of the lot is right-of-way and it will not be disturbed, the petitioner should measure closely to see if it will be under an acre, and allowances may be able to be made for that.

- Nick Redden – Said that the project was outside his jurisdiction and so he had no comments.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Asked if any of the structures would be protected by a fire suppression system.

The petitioner was not sure.

- Gary Hoyt then asked for somebody to simply respond to the letter with an answer.

- Gary Hoyt said that they would ask for a Knox-box on each building.

- Gary Hoyt also asked if any of the buildings would have a basement.

The petitioner said that the only one that would might be the petitioner's office building, but they are not certain yet.

The petitioner also asked where Gary Hoyt would like the addresses.

Gary Hoyt said that the addresses needed to be properly displayed on the building so that it can be seen at the street. Bill Akers will be the one to assign the addresses. A keystone would be fine.

Gary Hoyt also wanted to utilize a master key system so that they could just put one key in the Knox-box that would open all the tenants' suites. He would like one per building for both front and back doors.

Scott Brewer – Would be glad to sit down and discuss the plans with the petitioner. Along 421 there is supposed to be a 30-foot greenbelt buffer, and also a 6-foot planting strip for the buildings in the front.

The petitioner thought that the 6-foot could be within the 30 foot.

Scott Brewer said that it is usually in addition to.

The petitioner thought that for a previous project they only did 30 feet and so that is what they were proposing for this project.

- Scott Brewer said it may have been a variance for some previous projects, but he did not think that it was the case here.

- Scott Brewer also said that foundation plantings are required around all of the buildings and they were not included on the plan that he received. Also, the out lots that have parking in front on Michigan Road, the requirement is to have a tree or a shrub for every 6 spaces not for every 9 spaces.

- Scott Brewer also noted that the plans he got did not have any dimensions on it at all, and so it was hard for him to check things.

The petitioner asked if the foundation plan went all the way around.

- Scott Brewer said that was correct, but that on the plans he had it was not shown as being all the way around the buildings.

The petitioner said that the reason they had not included it on the plans was because the back lots would come back for their own review.

Scott Brewer said that was fine, but it was not indicated on the plans. He also offered to get together to go over the plans.

Matt Griffin – Sent a comment letter. He had no additional comments.

The petitioner said they are working on the legal description. The petitioner would also like to make sure that the Allen building was separate from theirs, and that their process would not be included with this project. The petitioner asked about the request to provide 8-foot building recessions and projections.

- Matt Griffin said that anything within the 421 Overlay is required to have a projection after a certain distance on the building wall.

The petitioner also had a question about signage. They had thought that the sign area of the monument sign could be a maximum of 75 square feet, not more than 2/3 of the total sign so that the overall sign could be 9 foot and the 2/3 of the sign would be 6 feet.

- Matt Griffin said that he would look into, but he was not sure of the history and what they were told earlier. It could be figured out.

The petitioner also had an issue with the size of the signs. The signs closer to 421 but close to Weston Drive would be smaller than the signs further back. They do not think that the differing of sizes of the signs looks very good, but they cannot make the signs in the very back as small as the ones in the front because then those would not be visible.

- Matt Griffin said that it would be a variance issue, and if the ordinance were causing the development or signage to look weird than it is something they would like to work with. Also the ordinance will be in regards to the street that the sign will be facing.

- Gary Hoyt – Asked about the areas in front of the retail buildings where there is no parking allowed, and if they could incorporate a fire lane. They could also talk about it with out-lot 2. Usually it is a 3-foot stripe from the curb with the words fire lane.

The petitioner said that they would probably do the same or similar on the back.

- The petitioner also mentioned the 10-foot asphalt path along Michigan Road, and that they were checking into it and they think that it might be part of INDOT's project. They will look into that.

- Gary Hoyt asked the architect if he knew if any of the buildings were proposed to be sprinkled right now.

The petitioner said that it depends on what the overall square footage is determined to be.

The 12,000 one will not be sprinkled. The 16,000 could possibly have to be sprinkled.

- Gary Hoyt asked about the office building in the back.

The petitioner said that yes that would be a sprinkled building.

- Gary Hoyt said that they would probably need to set up a meeting to determine where to put the fire connection.

The petitioner will need to resubmit the drawings.

...END...

Docket No. 05070014 SP: Stanford Park Section 2

The applicant seeks to plat 102 lots on 31.3 acres.

The site is located north of the NW corner of Shelborne Rd. and W. 131st St. and is zoned R2.

Filed by Dennis Olmstead of Stoeppelwerth and Assoc. for Platinum Properties, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Ed Fleming, Stoeppelwerth
Steve Broermann, Platinum Properties

The project is a continuation out of section 1.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter. Had a few comments on the SSDs. There are some rear yard swales that border up to the wooded area that are part of Shelborne Park, and he would like them to do everything they can to make sure water goes that way because of complaints of water standing in the woods.

The petitioner said that they would try not to disturb any of those trees.

- Greg Hoyes also needs a landscape plan.

- Also, in a plat common are 2a there has been some storm drainage that has been put in other sections. The petitioner needs to show the easements there.

- Chuck Shupperd – Said that they would just come out of section 1.

- John South – Owed a letter.

- Nick Redden – Sent a letter. Would wait for the petitioner's comments.

- Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Asked if the section would have an amenity in it.

The petitioner said no.

- Scott Brewer – Received a draft plan, and will just wait.

The petitioner is just waiting to incorporate the newfound existing trees.

- Matt Griffin – Sent a letter. Did not have any big issues besides labeling on the plat.

...END...

Docket No. 05070016 SP: Longridge Estates Section 2

The applicant seeks to plat 52 lots on 57 acres.

The site is located at the SW corner of W. 141st St. and Shelborne Rd. and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by Dennis Olmstead of Stoeppelwerth and Assoc. for Platinum Properties, LLC.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Ed Fleming, Stoeppelwerth
Steve Broermann, Platinum Properties

The project is just west of Section 1, which was approved this past spring. The utilities will be extended out of that.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter. The biggest concern was the surface drainage that goes under the pipeline there. That is different than what was shown on the primary plat. There are concerns of that dumping on the surface and running across under West Road and through the neighbors' properties that way. Also had some concerns with the construction plans, and with houses and driveways in their easements.

- Greg Hoyes did receive landscape plans, but there were some trees shown in the swales, banks of the ponds, and pretty close to the drains. He would like the petitioner to push some things around there.

- Chuck Shupperd – Vectren Energy will just come out of Section 1.

The petitioner said that Section 1 is under construction currently.

- Chuck Shupperd asked if Section 2 would be done in the spring?

The petitioner said that they would try to do some of the dirt and the utility work this year.

- John South – Owed the petitioner a letter. Since the section is 57 acres, he would like to see a phasing plan and a stabilization plan so that not all of it is disturbed at one time.

- Nick Redden – Sent a letter. The one thing that concerned them the most was the drainage easement that they had shown within the pipeline easement. Asked if it had been taken care of.

The petitioner asked if Nick Redden was referring to the lots being in the pipeline easement, and said that they would make the drainage easements to cover the pipeline. They will also take a look at the lots.

- Gary Hoyt – Asked if the circle in the “eyebrow” was going to be a planting area, at the corner of B Street and B Street.

The petitioner said yes, it would just be grass.

- Gary Hoyt asked them to put in a roll curb instead of a chair back curb.

The petitioner said that they would be roll curb.

- Scott Brewer – Had just recently gotten the plans, but he did not think that there were any problems. Unless he found something once he looked at it more closely, he did not have any comments.
- Matt Griffin – Sent a letter. Had no additional comments.

...END...

Docket No. 05070007 SP: Mayflower Park Block 3 Replat

The applicant seeks to replat 1 Block into 3 lots.

The site is located on W. 99th Street and is zoned I1.

Filed by James Browning.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Jaime Browning

The petitioner stated that the project is a 10-acre parcel located within Mayflower Park that is currently owned by RCI. It is the petitioner's intention to break it into 3 lots, which is the purpose of the replat. There is a small portion of the original plat that RCI is retaining ownership of, which they want to have to control ingress and egress into their property. The petitioner had made modifications in response to the comments they received.

- John South asked if the petitioner had a copy of the plans to pass around because most of the TAC members had not seen the plans.

- Chuck Shupperd asked if it was next to RCI the building, and is it part of the land.

The petitioner said that it is recognizable by a big concrete pad where a building used to be.

- John South asked if there was some kind of cross drainage easement applied to the plat. Since there is probably only one drainage outlet, there will need to be a way to get drainage from lot 1 to lot 3 if it has to go that way.

The petitioner said that there was already infrastructure in place for drainage into this parcel.

- John South asked if it was for each lot.

Jaime Browning said that it was for the entire parcel, and that there are declarations and covenants that govern the park to allow drainage into other sites.

- Greg Hoyes did not really have any comments because it was the first time he had seen the plans, but he would probably see it again because it would go through the county plan route.

- Greg Hoyes's main concern was that he wanted there to be actual platted easements to protect the pipes.

The petitioner asked why this was not an issue with any of the other lots.

- Greg Hoyes said that maybe the other lots did not have a storm sewer running through the middle of the lot. If the lot is sold and somebody wants to build a building over the storm pipes, then there might be a problem.
- John South thought that the main drainage infrastructure on the southern end of the project was along the road and that it was protected by easements.

The petitioner said that he would have the lawyers look into and make sure that there was not a legal problem.

- Matt Griffin – Sent a comment letter.

The petitioner asked about the comment regarding showing the lots terminating at the ingress/egress easement eastern edge.

- Matt Griffin said that it was a private street, so it may not be necessary.
- It was asked of the petitioner if anything had been planned for the lots yet.
The petitioner said that it might be some sort of warehouse or office, similar to across the street.

...END...

Docket No. 05070009 TAC: Kipp Brothers Expansion

The applicant seeks to expand their current facilities to include 26,400 sq. ft. of warehouse space.

The site is located at 9760 Mayflower Park Drive and is zoned I1.

Filed by Mike DeBoy of DeBoy Land Development Services for Glennco Realty.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Kevin Roberts

Kevin Roberts stated that they were proposing an expansion to the Kipp Brothers building in Mayflower Park. The parking area to the east of the site is shown across the swales, and they are removing the ten spaces there. This should still allow the site to have adequate parking. The issues in regard to the landscaping will be worked out. There is a fire hydrant located at the northwest corner of the site, but the applicant has requested that the hydrant not be located there. The drive along the back rather than being asphalt will be gravel.

- Greg Hoyes – Sent a comment letter, and would like drainage calculations when the Kevin Roberts gets them. Also, the removal of the ten parking lots should address his other main concern.
- Chuck Shupperd – Asked if the petitioner would be adding more heating equipment, or would they use existing because if they were going to increase the load then a data sheet needs to be

filled out for existing and proposed. Jerry Brief would be the contact person for that information.

- John South – Sent a comment letter. Would like to see the curb turn out changed in the parking lot where it discharges to structure 701.

The petitioner said that the original design showed curbs, but there were no curbs constructed on the original construction, so the applicant would like to change that and sheet flow everything to the existing drainage systems.

- John South did not have a problem with that as long as it did not conflict with other ordinances. That would then address his concern with the curb turn out.

- John South also noted that if their construction limits are going to stay away from the swale then everything should be all right.

- John South then commented that the sill fence that is shown needs to be on the west side of the swale not on the east side to stop the sediment before it gets to the swale.

- Nick Redden – Did not have any comment because it is outside his jurisdiction.
Kevin Roberts verified that he could disregard the letter from Crossroads

- Gary Hoyt – Said that the fire hydrant that the applicant wanted to remove could be removed because he found another fire hydrant.

- Gary Hoyt also thought that they were putting in a surface that would attach to the road if it were allowable. If the owner said that they did not want pavement or gravel going out to the road, then grass type pavers to support the fire truck would work.

Kevin Roberts also mentioned the meter on the fire hydrant.

In regards to a previous phone call with Gary Hoyt, Kevin Roberts said that he had given him correct answers. The fdic is not being affected, the sprinklers are being connected, the height is the same and there is no basement.

- Scott Brewer – He was basically just concerned about the plants on the north side and the wood preservation area on the west side. He asked if the gravel road in the back just went back to the new addition or if it went all the way around the building and if swale was outside of that.

Kevin Roberts said that the road went all the way around the building and that the swale was outside of that. Another issue, however, is that the structure is going away and the roof drains are going to discharge directly into the swale rather than into the inlet.

It was a new drainage swale on the side of the site, and all that was there currently was grass.

- Matt Griffin – Sent a comment letter. Asked if there would be mechanical equipment on the extension and would there be screening.

Kevin Roberts did not know at the time.

- Matt Griffin said that they could get that figured out.

...END...

Docket No. 05060051 PP: The Retreat of West Clay Primary Plat

The applicant seeks approval of 32 lots on 23.49 acres:

The site is located near the NE corner of Little Eagle Creek Ave and W. 141st St.
and is zoned S1/Residential

Filed by Jim Shinaver of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Jim Shinaver, Nelson and Frankenberger

Jon Isaacs

Gordon Kritz, Stoeppelwerth & Associates

Greg Hoyes – Sent a letter. It will be a regulated drain subdivision. There will be some off site easement required. The easement will have to be partly recorded in Hamilton County and partly recorded in Boone County. He had contacted the Boone County Surveyor's Office to see if they had any concerns about the drainage, but he had not heard back from them yet.

There are also some landscape conflicts, but other than that he will just look for construction plans and drainage calculations when they become available.

- Chuck Shupperd – He will probably bring the facilities from the Platinum Properties. Asked if the petitioner knew the route of the water/sewer, and how it would get off site to this project.

The petitioner did not know.

- Chuck Shupperd said that it is something that they might want to look into as well as maybe doing a joint venture with a water/gas/utility easement.

The petitioner thought that water was coming to the east of the property, and that they would stay in touch with him to determine where off site infrastructure will be coming from.

- Chuck Shupperd said that the petitioner could send him a proposed route so that he might be able to try to follow that same route.

- John South – Sent a letter. One of his comments was that once the petitioner's construction plans start coming through, the new storm water quality requirements are going to be in affect. The county has passed the ordinance. It has not been established as the current criteria, but it will be shortly. In all likelihood the project will have to meet the new requirements. Bob Thompson in the Surveyor's Office could probably give them more information. The requirements are very similar to what's been established in Marion County.

- John South also commented that the reforestation of areas 2 and 4 would be a positive thing to do, as well as naturalizing their pond bank vegetation.

- Nick Redden – Sent comments and will await revised plan comments.

The petitioner had a question about the entry way and the treatment of the medians as a boulevard. Jim Shinaver was wondering why the Engineering Department had asked them to remove the medians.

- Nick Redden did not necessarily see the reason for the medians, and maybe just did not understand those. He is also trying to reduce the amount of pavement. He did not remember what the lane width was, but it could have been a maintenance problem for such things as snow plowing.

Jim Shinaver wanted to set up a meeting to discuss it. He said that idea was to create a boulevard entrance type of feel. He thought it added to the aesthetic value as to how the project is perceived.

Gary Hoyt – Sent a letter. Requested a set of plans indicating fire hydrant locations, and asked if they were projecting an amenity building or clubhouse.

The petitioner said no.

- Gary Hoyt – Also asked that fire hydrant markers be installed perpendicular to the fire hydrants in the center of the road.

- Gary Hoyt asked if the project would be gated.

The petitioner said no.

- Gary Hoyt would also like a set of engineer plans, because he is concerned with the width of the entry and the ease of being able to get fire trucks and equipment in past the boulevard.

The petitioner said that the pavement width was 16 feet.

- Scott Brewer – Did not have many comments besides species comments. There is one species on the median that is not marked on the plant schedule, and he would like that marked.

- Matt Griffin – Had a comment letter. His only main concern was in regards to making open space more useful and approachable, and he would suggest adding a feature such as a sitting area or a path to pull people around the pond to enjoy it. It is not a requirement, but something that they might run into in Plan Commission. Matt Griffin also said that the plan did a good job at fulfilling the requirements of the ordinance.

...END...

Docket No. 05070005 SP: Penn View Heights Replat (Burford Office Park)

The applicant seeks to replat 5 lots on to accommodate an office development. The site is located at 10430 Delaware St. N and is zoned B5 (pending), and is within the Home Place District Overlay Zone.

Filed by Jessica Hartman of Parsons, Cunningham, and Shartle Engineers, Inc. for Burford Properties

REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER:

Jim Shinaver, Nelson and Frankenberger

Jim Shinaver presented the project as being in conjunction with Burford Office Park.

- Greg Hoyes – Did not have any comments because he had not seen the plat.

Jim Shinaver noted that with the plat there is a residential home that is adjacent to Delaware, and that is going to remain a residential home so nothing will be changed on that lot.

- Chuck Shupperd – Did not have any comments on the replat.

- John South – Did not have any comment.

- Nick Redden – Did not have any comment because it is not within his jurisdiction.

- Scott Brewer – Had comments on the landscape plan, but did not think that it had anything to do with this replat.

- Matt Griffin – Sent a letter to Ms. Hartman. Asked if lot 17 was getting split in half because the lot lines were slightly confusing.

Jim Shinaver would talk with the applicant and get back with him.

...END...

The meeting ended around 3:30